



Ag 84 M  
Copy 3

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Extension  
Service

Cooperative  
State Research  
Service

Office of  
Higher Education

Agricultural  
Research  
Service

Miscellaneous  
Publication  
Number 1418

15

# State Strategies for New Initiatives in Home Economics



APR 2 28 '82

U.S.D.A.  
NAT'L AGRIC LIBRARY  
SERIALS SECTION  
CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS



## Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Extension  
Service

Cooperative  
State Research  
Service

Office of  
Higher Education

Agricultural  
Research  
Service

Miscellaneous  
Publication  
Number 1418

December 1981

# State Strategies for New Initiatives in Home Economics

Frances M. Magrabi  
Georgianne R. Baker



A 1981 report, A Comprehensive National Plan for New Initiatives in Home Economics Research, Extension, and Higher Education, contained specific national needs that had been identified for new or expanded work in family economic stability and security; energy and environment; food, nutrition, and health; and family strengths and social environment.\* This national plan had its inspiration in the Food and Agricultural Act of 1977 (PL 95-113), which called for "new federal initiatives...improving and expanding the research and extension programs in home economics..." Development of the report was guided by a national Steering Committee consisting of representatives of land-grant and State universities and colleges, professional organizations, and user groups and concerned agencies. Following this publication, the Steering Committee met to consider what should be done to facilitate State program plans and priorities based on the national plan. It was believed that the soundest basis for planning would be actual experiences of States in using the national report. Accordingly, State planning workshops were held in four States.

This report, presenting results and strategies from the workshops, is directed to leaders in institutions concerned with home economics programs in research, extension, and higher education. The report, intended for use in conjunction with the national report, has as its purposes to:

- o Describe the planning workshop format, which was used successfully in the four States, so that other States might consider incorporating the approach in their program planning activities; and
- o Identify the strategies which appeared as themes in the workshops to illustrate ways in which State institutions may adapt the national plan for new initiatives.

---

\* Published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Science and Education Administration, as Misc. Pub. 1405, Jan. 1981, available from Extension Service Publications, Distribution and Requests, Rm. 6005 South Bldg., U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

State Strategies for New Initiatives in Home Economics is designed as a companion publication to A Comprehensive National Plan for New Initiatives in Home Economics Research, Extension, and Higher Education. Both reports were prepared under the auspices of the Science and Education Coordination Office (formerly Program Planning Staff) of the Director, Science and Education, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Frances M. Magrabi (program coordinator responsible for preparation of the comprehensive national plan) served as project leader for the experimental State workshops. Georgianne R. Baker (U.S. Department of Agriculture Coordinator for Home Economics during the term of the project) shared responsibility for designing and conducting the workshops.

Many persons and organizations contributed to the success of the project. Although all workshops followed a common format developed by the authors, much of the success of the endeavor was due to the leadership of the planning committees in Illinois, Oregon, Virginia, and Nebraska. The National Steering Committee for New Initiatives in Home Economics gave advice and encouragement; workshop participants contributed their time and expertise; and the sponsoring organizations, which included institutions in the respective States and Science and Education agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, provided essential support. Technical review of this report was performed by: Marilyn M. Dunsing, Director, School of Human Resources and Family Studies, University of Illinois; Betty Hawthorne, Dean, School of Home Economics, Oregon State University; S. J. Ritchie, Dean, College of Home Economics and Assistant Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Roberta E. Sward, Assistant Director for Home Economics, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Nebraska; Marjorie Rankin, Dean, Nesbitt College, Drexel University, and Chair, National Steering Committee for New Initiatives in Home Economics. Other members of the State workshop planning committees and the National Steering Committee also gave technical review.

Within the U.S. Department of Agriculture administrative support and encouragement were provided by Anson R. Bertrand, Director, Science and Education; by Ernest L. Corley, Director, Science and Education Coordination Office; and by administrators and staff of the Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and Agricultural Research Service. Editing and clerical support were provided by, respectively, Judith Armstrong Bowers, Extension Service Information Office, and Sue Dixon, National Program Staff.

## CONTENTS

|   |   |    |  |
|---|---|----|--|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION  | 9  | Higher Education   |
| 2 | FORMAT FOR PLANNING   | 9  | <u>Undertake an assessment of trained workforce needs</u>  |
| 5 | STRATEGIES  | 9  | <u>Modify curricula or strengthen curriculum requirements</u>  |
| 5 | Research  | 9  | <u>Work with other disciplines, institutions, and agencies</u>   |
| 5 | <u>Strengthen needs assessment</u>  | 9  | <u>Evaluate program results</u>  |
| 6 | <u>Make better use of existing data</u>   | 10 | Coordination and Integration of Research, Extension, and Higher Education  |
| 6 | <u>Build comprehensive data base</u>  | 10 | <u>Strengthen coordinating links among functional areas</u>  |
| 6 | <u>Obtain data on positive as well as negative aspects of problems</u>                              | 10 | <u>Develop coordinated programs with business and industry, other agencies, and organizations</u>                            |
| 6 | <u>Conduct interdisciplinary studies</u>  | 10 | <u>Establish statewide steering or coordinating body</u>   |
| 6 | <u>Conduct research to evaluate effectiveness of educational and human service delivery systems</u> | 10 | Interaction with Constituencies and Support Groups   |
| 7 | Extension   | 10 | <u>Establish home economics concerns in the agendas of existing advisory groups</u>  |
| 7 | <u>Improve needs assessment</u>   | 11 | <u>Establish a focal point for initiating action</u>   |
| 7 | <u>Use comprehensive data</u>   | 11 | <u>Strengthen home economics programs as links between families and public agencies, organizations, or other disciplines</u> |
| 7 | <u>Focus on positive aspects</u>  | 11 |  |
| 7 | <u>Evaluate program outcomes</u>  | 11 |  |
| 8 | <u>Initiate focused expansion of programs</u>   | 11 |  |
| 8 | <u>Improve program delivery to focus groups</u>   | 11 |  |
| 8 | <u>Upgrade knowledge and competence of educators and service providers</u>                          | 11 |  |
| 8 | <u>Develop joint or coordinated programs with other agencies and organizations</u>                  | 12 |  |



## INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to encourage and facilitate joint planning by leaders of home economics research, extension, and higher education in States. Intrastate planning is needed for several reasons:

- o Although the national initiatives focus on objectives (for example, program needs and focus groups) that are generally valid in all States, their importance will vary by State, and selection and adaptation are necessary to tailor efforts to particular State programs and institutional arrangements.
- o Federal funds are only one source of budgetary support. Other sources --State, county, private foundation, business, and industry -- should be utilized to support expanded or redirected effort. Hence, planners must consult with representatives of these funding sources and adapt their plans to funding source requirements.
- o Efficient use of budget resources requires careful long-range planning, ordering of priorities, and linkage of research and education.
- o Issues about strengthening the system which provide research and education--identified in the national report--must be dealt with if new efforts are to be effective and efficient. Means by which the issues can be addressed and resolved effectively depend on recognition of issues by professionals in the State, on State leadership in finding solutions, and on use of State organizations.

Few guidelines exist for bringing about good articulation (meshing) of State with national plans and of research plans with plans for educational programs that use research results. The task of bringing about good articulation is complex. State programs do not coincide with national ones, but may vary in mission and scope. Differences among States in staffing, institutional arrangements, and budget constraints affect how well States can perform work that is needed nationally. Planning for coordination of research with educational applications is difficult. Planners of educational offerings draw on research data from many sources, research studies may take years to complete, and applicable results cannot be guaranteed at the time that research is planned or when it is needed by educators. In the absence of established guidelines for bringing about good articulation of plans, program planners may find it useful to examine the experiences of others who have attempted to develop plans that coordinate research, extension, and higher education.

Experimental State planning workshops were held in four States (Illinois, Nebraska, Oregon, and Virginia) in June-July 1981. Although each workshop was planned and sponsored by home economics institutions within the State, each was designed to have a similar format. The workshops were designed to foster coordination and integration of planning: among functions, among institutions, and among levels -- county, State, and national. Several means were taken to promote this result:

- o Selection of sponsors and participants -- Care was taken to involve all those levels and organizational units among which coordination was needed.
- o Organization of workshop by tasks -- To reduce confusion in accomplishing the complex purposes of the workshops, planners divided the work into tasks to be addressed in sequence. These tasks were:
  - (a) Orientation - Current status of national planning effort; overview of home economics programs in the State; social and demographic trends in the State; review of issues and planning concepts; identification of initiatives and (if previously selected) focus groups.
  - (b) Development of outcome targets.
  - (c) Development of corresponding action targets.

(d) Synthesis of action targets for greater efficiency.

(e) Establishment of priorities.

(f) Reporting and feedback -- Each discussion group reported on the plans they had developed; the total group raised questions and discussed possible strategies to handle them; and a reactor panel commented on strengths and weaknesses of the plans, unresolved issues, and opportunities for followup.

In the workshop agendas, tasks (d) and (e) were combined with other tasks, and (perhaps for this reason) proved to be the most difficult to accomplish.

- o Consideration of the total system -- The national steering committee identified five areas of need within the total system of knowledge generation and dissemination. These were the following: convenient and accessible program delivery outlets; research and transfer of research findings; professional education in the methodologies and scientific and technical subject matter needed to conduct research and extension programs; communication among research, extension, and higher education;

and communication among constituencies that can provide support and guidance to the program and staff in research, extension, and higher education. These five areas -- termed functional areas -- were used as categories within which the participants were asked to develop targets.

- o Implementation issues. A number of issues of national concern had been identified as aspects requiring to be dealt with in order for new program initiatives to be successful and efficient.<sup>1/</sup> These were called to the attention of workshop participants.
- o Selection of initiatives and focus groups -- So that identity with the national effort could be maintained, State workshop planners were asked to select initiatives from those proposed nationally. They were further asked to select a focus group or groups which might not have been identified nationally but which were of priority concern in the State.
- o Establishment and coordination of targets -- Participants first established target outcomes for each initiative; that is, they described the situation or result they wanted to bring about. Then they established corresponding action targets;

that is, actions which needed to be undertaken or arrangements which needed to be created in order to bring about the desired outcome, together with 2-, 5-, and 10-year target dates for completing actions or having arrangements in place. By focusing attention first on desired outcome and then on action, participants were encouraged to think in terms of initiation rather than continuance of existing efforts. Asking for completion dates led participants to consider how activities needed to be sequenced and how to ensure that results from one activity would be available to others when needed. It also drew attention to the need to show results within a reasonable time.

- o Matrix approach -- Targets could be considered either from the perspective of the functional areas (mentioned above) or of subject matter expertise. Both perspectives were useful. Therefore, discussion was organized so that each perspective was dominant in some stage of the process. As identification of desirable outcomes was considered to be the special concern of subject experts, the discussion groups formed to establish outcome targets included persons most knowledgeable about the initiative from a subject matter point of view, and subject matter experts from research, extension, and higher education.

---

<sup>1/</sup> MP 1405, op cit., pp. 23-25.

These initiatives groups were asked to develop outcome targets for each functional area for their assigned initiative. Once outcome targets were established, the participants were regrouped by functional area, given a copy of outcome targets pertaining to their area for all initiatives, and asked to describe actions and responsibilities to achieve the outcomes. The latter groups were called synthesis groups, because they needed to synthesize actions and outcomes to create an efficient and workable plan.

- o Integration with existing programs -- Participants were given information about existing programs in the State and, at the same time that they developed action targets, were encouraged to identify organizations which ought to be involved as leader, performer, facilitator, funding source, or authorizing unit. Integration was difficult for participants to achieve as an outcome because the workshops took place outside normal planning systems. Special arrangements and commitments were needed so that, following the workshop, results could be incorporated into actual plans of the organizations represented at the workshop. Because organizations often have established planning cycles, some had already developed long- and short-range objectives and plans. Participants saw advantages in coordinated planning and were eager to implement the strategies

they had developed, but were uncertain about procedures. In all States, they decided on followup meetings.

Further details regarding format and procedures are contained in the appendix.

## STRATEGIES

Four general classes of characteristics influenced the strategies developed through workshop discussion: the State's population trends and household demographics; other indications of need, including statements of State program priorities; budget situation and expectations; and the State's higher education programs in home economics (number, size, geographic distribution, institutional affiliation, and program emphasis).

The workshops were held on the campuses of land-grant universities, where home economics research is funded partially through the State agricultural experiment stations. One State had both an 1860 and an 1890 land-grant institution which conduct research and cooperate on some projects. All land-grant institutions (including the 1890 institutions) have Cooperative Extension programs conducted by a network of county, regional and university-based faculty and program development staff. The number of institutions conducting research and offering both graduate and undergraduate degrees in each of the four States ranged from one to six.

The State workshops, viewed as a whole, addressed all the major thrusts identified for new effort in the national plan: family economic security and stability; energy and environment; food, nutrition, and health; family strengths and social environments. Each State focused on four to five initiatives. Two States selected initiatives from each thrust area and one general focus group: young families in one State, and two-paycheck families in the other. The third State selected initiatives from two thrusts with a separate focus group for each initiative; the fourth State chose to concentrate on all initiatives in a single thrust. The workshop planning committees selected those initiatives for which they saw (a) sub-

stantial need in the State, (b) insufficient effort, and (c) home economics capability to expand.

A number of themes appeared in the workshop reports. These were general ideas or approaches--strategies--that appeared in connection with more than one functional area, in more than one initiative, or in more than one State. For example, the idea of focusing on positive benefits to families was mentioned in connection with energy-conserving practices and also stress management, and in connection with research, extension, and higher education. Because the intent of this report is to share ideas that may be useful in other States, we use these themes as a basis for selecting and grouping strategies.

Examples of specific strategies are included with some themes to illustrate the intention of participants, adaptation to the State setting, or an insightful approach to implementing a particular initiative. The strategies selected as examples were not necessarily endorsed by the workshop groups for immediate action and are not to be regarded either as State or Federal policy.

### Research

#### Strengthen Needs Assessment

Workshop participants saw needs assessment as an integral part of the research process. They viewed it in two ways: (a) as the outcome of a process of reviewing the literature on a given topic and identifying gaps in what is known, and (b) as a product of information exchange with extension educators and service providers to families.

Specific strategies:

- o Establish a joint task force of research, extension, and higher education staff to conduct needs assessment.
- o Channel assessments developed by extension staff to researchers.

Make Better Use of Existing Data

Workshop participants in all four States said that more research data exist than are put into use. A clearinghouse was mentioned often as a mechanism for improving access to existing data. Participants did not resolve whether a data bank and/or clearinghouse should be set up in each State, in each region, or nationally.

Specific strategy:

- o Encourage academic researchers to prepare state-of-the-art papers at three levels: (a) for program planners, to help them establish program directions and plans for delivery of services; (b) for researchers, to help them identify gaps in knowledge and problems needing further study, and (c) for educators, to provide them with the most complete and up-to-date compilation of information possible.

Build Comprehensive Data Base

The strategy of building a comprehensive data base recurred with nearly every initiative. Both compiling and improving the accessibility of existing data were included, as was collecting new data of particular kinds. Participants expressed strongly the need for longitudinal data on families and the need for data that describe or specifically apply to State populations.

Specific strategies:

- o Identify pools of existing data, from local (State) and national sources.
- o Obtain data showing the impact of changing economic conditions on families within the State.
- o Establish data base needed by families for realistic planning and implementing of economic strategies at different life cycle stages.

Obtain Data on Positive as well as Negative Aspects of Problems

Specific strategy:

- o Develop measures of family strengths.

Conduct Interdisciplinary Studies

This recurring theme--conducting interdisciplinary studies--grew out of recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of problems. This theme also reflected an underlying strategy: More interaction among researchers in different areas of home economics and more joint undertakings of home economics researchers with researchers in other disciplines would strengthen the home economics research effort and the efforts of other disciplines.

Conduct Research to Evaluate Effectiveness of Educational and Human Service Delivery Systems

This theme--the involvement of researchers in evaluation--appeared in several States and several forms. Participants saw evaluation as a research function (which might, of course, be performed by extension staff). This theme also reflects the view that

research should be integrally related to application and action. One group identified evaluation of educational programs as a step in the process of conducting research to generate new knowledge. The kind of evaluation referred to in the theme would be an indirect but meaningful evaluation of the preceding research.

#### Extension

Many of the research themes had an Extension perspective and application also. Other themes, having to do with program delivery, were specific to Extension and other nonformal education.

#### Improve Needs Assessment

Participants recognized that research reports can reveal needs for Extension offerings. They also recognized that information obtained by Extension may be useful to researchers for establishing and justifying research priorities. Sharing research- or extension-based needs assessments with other educational or service agencies may encourage those agencies to fill some identified needs. Therefore, sharing of such needs information should be encouraged as a strategy that would ultimately benefit the users of Cooperative Extension. Unresolved issues, both for researchers and Extension staff, were possible differences in their respective approaches to needs assessment. Researchers favor scientific sampling procedures, while Extension staff favor panels or groups selected on a judgmental or convenience basis. Researchers must develop findings that can be generalized to many situations; Extension staff must have results that apply to a specific situation.

#### Specific strategy:

- o Develop ongoing organization for sharing of intended program emphases and needs assessments.

#### Use Comprehensive Data

The need for data that are comprehensive (covering all areas of family behavior) rather than narrowly limited originates from the problems addressed in extension programs. Problems of families in one area (for example, family relationships) may suggest deeper seated difficulties in another area (for example financial management).

#### Focus on Positive Aspects

Directing attention to productive and creative aspects of a behavior change is an educational strategy. The need for research data on positive aspects, mentioned earlier, stemmed from this educational strategy.

#### Evaluate Program Outcomes

Participants consistently included evaluation in workshop proposals as a normal and essential step, one useful at several stages in program development and implementation.

#### Specific strategies:

- o Identify and evaluate the scope and effectiveness of existing service providers and programs (as a part of needs assessment).
- o Examine effectiveness of extension program delivery methods and explore alternative modes of delivery (as a part of program design and planning).

- o Evaluate effectiveness of educational methods being used (as a continuous part of program delivery).
- o Evaluate program effectiveness in impact on families and communities (as a fulfillment of the obligation to be accountable for use of public funds).
- o Use evaluation data to modify programs in process or guide new program development.

#### Initiate Focused Expansion of Programs

The concept of directing program efforts to specific focus groups was accepted as a useful approach in each of the States. A strategy for expansion, discussed in several States, was to select new focus groups to add to the current clientele or to concentrate expanded efforts on a few specific groups of highest need. In this context, two States selected a single focus group as the target of all the initiatives under discussion.

#### Specific strategies:

- o Provide Extension offerings to new groups: Men's groups, daycare providers, and employers.
- o Provide expanded offerings statewide to a single focus group: Young families (in one State); the two-paycheck family (in another State).

#### Improve Program Delivery to Focus Groups

Improving program delivery had several dimensions: improvement in the matching of delivery modes and locations to focus

group; improved timing of adjustments to changing conditions; and improved effectiveness in exploiting available technology.

#### Specific strategy:

- o Have in place extension programs to provide information on stress management in locations of greatest need for such programs. Let potential users know such assistance is available.

#### Upgrade Knowledge and Competence of Educators and Service Providers

Workshop participants in all States recognized that new program initiatives require that the professionals involved have new or upgraded training. In several instances, this recognition became strategy for program change.

#### Specific strategy:

- o Provide consultation and noncredit education to assist daycare providers to select and prepare more nutritious food choices and to teach nutrition to preschoolers.

#### Develop Joint or Coordinated Programs with Other Agencies and Organizations

In each State, participants listed several sources of similar program offerings. This list was used to build strategies to multiply the impact of new effort.

#### Specific strategy:

- o Identify the network of sources of nonformal education and encourage collaboration. Identify and, where appropriate, integrate agendas (plans of action) of participating organizations.

## Higher Education

Several of the themes in research and nonformal education had counterparts in strategies for higher education.

### Undertake an Assessment of Trained Workforce Needs 2/

This strategy was proposed as a joint undertaking by institutions of higher learning with input from concerned agencies in the State. In addition to providing data that could be directly translatable into curriculum additions or revisions, this strategy could have useful spinoffs in the form of justification of instructional budgets and contacts with potential employers of home economics graduates.

### Specific strategy:

- o Evaluate current pool of professionals in the State for (a) adequate quantity in the high-priority thrust and initiatives areas and (b) appropriate knowledge, application skills, and abilities.

### Modify Curricula or Strengthen Curriculum Requirements

In addition to effects that curriculum changes may have on the professional competence of graduates, workshop groups saw modifying or strengthening curriculum requirements as a way of signaling to prospective employers, students, and the public that home economists would be assuming new roles.

2/ A recent report relates to this strategy: Kyle Jane Coulter and Marge Stanton, Graduates of Higher Education in the Food and Agricultural Sciences; An Analysis of Supply/Demand Relationships Volume II Home Economics, February 1981 (available from Extension Service Publications; see Preface for address).

### Specific strategies:

- o Examine home economics core requirements, curricula, and programs. This task is the responsibility of higher education faculties with input from prospective employers (such as Extension, business, community agencies, and research institutions).
- o Train professionals and practitioners through graduate study and continuing education courses to identify family needs and to use data in program plans, budget proposals, needs assessment, and evaluation.
- o Strengthen science components in the general education of home economics undergraduates.
- o Establish more cross listing of courses among departments; create and/or strengthen dual majors and minors.
- o Design practicum experiences in family resource management to include working with two-paycheck families and families in stress-producing settings.

### Work with Other Disciplines, Institutions, and Agencies

This theme--working with other disciplines, institutions, and agencies--has two dimensions: delineation of the respective responsibilities of home economics instructional programs in the State, and goal-directed interaction with other professions or disciplines.

### Evaluate Program Results

Workshop groups emphasized evaluation of graduates of instructional programs.

Participants regarded the ultimate criterion for effectiveness as being the successful and measurable implementation of research and/or nonformal education initiatives by graduates.

Specific strategy:

- o Determine effectiveness of existing programs by following up with graduates and employers.

Coordination and Integration of Research, Extension, and Higher Education

Coordination and integration of research, extension, and higher education received attention in most of the workshop discussions because the workshop format and guidelines focused attention on these activities. Workshop group members spent much time in delineation of optimum coordination and integration and means for achieving these goals.

Strengthen Coordinating Links among Functional Areas

The workshop groups proposed several actions to implement the general strategy of strengthening links among functional areas by providing formal and informal opportunities or occasions for communication among staff members or with outside groups.

Specific strategies:

- o Establish more joint appointments combining research and extension; establish joint appointments to involve faculty in other departments; provide extension faculty with funded opportunities to carry out research; give greater recognition to integrated research-extension activities as a basis for promotion and tenure.

- o Teach students and educators to apply research findings and to recognize areas where research is needed.
- o Prepare and publish an overview report giving information on status of home economics research, teaching, and nonformal education in the State.

Develop Coordinated Programs with Business and Industry, Other Agencies and Organizations

Proposals ranged from informal communications during planning of research and educational programs to the more structured strategies described below. The strategy of developing joint budget displays, proposed in one State, is now a requirement in Federal agencies and may become a requirement of budget review units in some States.

Specific strategies:

- o Establish a formal process for integrating (across institutions and agencies) the program and budget exhibits for a given program initiative. Provide this integrated budget display to the legislature as an aid to appropriation decisions.
- o Establish a computerized statewide clearinghouse for information on research and services on a given initiative.

Establish Statewide Steering or Coordinating Body

In each of the four State workshops, participants concluded that a committee or other body was needed within the State to continue dialogue begun at the workshop and to facilitate action on the strategies. Few other occasions brought

together the particular mix of persons who had been invited to the workshop, and discussions had revealed many possibilities for useful cooperation. Participants saw the need for some continuing body to stimulate, facilitate, and coordinate action.

Specific strategy:

- o Establish a statewide coordinating committee including representatives from research, higher education, extension, paraprofessional groups, public education, local, State, and national government, business and industry, and extension clientele.

Interaction with Constituencies and Support Groups

Basic questions of strategy emerged from the workshop discussions: (1) Should new organizations be formed to communicate with the interested public, invite advice, and channel public comments to decisionmakers; or should home economics concerns be incorporated into the agendas of existing advisory bodies? (2) What institution or organization should take the lead (become the focal point) to act on the recommendations from workshops? (3) What image should home economists seek for themselves?

Establish Home Economics Concerns in the Agendas of Existing Advisory Groups

Participants tended believe that existing organizations should be used to bring home economics concerns to the attention of policy or decisionmaking bodies. They further believed that these concerns are shared by many who are not home economists. In the strategy examples that follow, one State proposed involving existing organizations in a family-oriented coalition

focusing on a specific concern (consumer credit). Another State proposed that several organizations already strongly committed to home economics seek to become part of an existing (and influential) advisory group.

Specific strategies:

- o Request that the Governor establish a committee on consumer education to coordinate consumer credit efforts. Involve the agribusiness council, Better Business Bureau, local offices of the Farm Bureau, the State joint council on economic education, credit counselors, and other existing consumer education groups.
- o Propose the State home economics association for membership in the State agriculture research advisory council, which is involved with setting research priorities and establishing rapport with the legislature and the state board of higher education.

Establish a Focal Point for Initiating Action

This theme, with State variations, was part of the discussion in all four workshops. In two States in which a single institution provides most of the home economics offerings in higher education, research, and extension, that institution was proposed as a focal point. In the other States, a coalition of home economics units was thought best.

Specific strategies:

- o Provide leadership and support at the university level to develop common goals for groups interested in the welfare of families. Begin

with a steering committee made up of representatives from agencies, community groups, professional organizations, service groups, and representatives of nontraditional families and minorities.

- o Raise level of awareness by having university faculty present state-of-the-art papers in regard to research, education, and application in local settings. Organize statewide forums for these presentations.

Strengthen Home Economics Programs as Links Between Families and Public Agencies, Organizations, or Other Disciplines

Home economics was viewed as the discipline linking families and individuals with their physical, social, and economic environments. This ecological theme emerged in all States in specific strategies.

Specific strategies:

- o Communicate family needs for energy conservation education to business, community organizations, and government agencies.
- o Bring professionals together who share mutual interests, goals, and agenda items. Involve families in the decisionmaking process about issues affecting them.
- o Develop coordinated programs with business and industry, in which home economics professionals serve as a communicating link between families and business and industry.
- o Initiate appropriate training programs and establish effective systems for dealing with emergency stress situations in rural settings.

Include in such systems, ministers, doctors, home economists, and others.

- o Share progress reports with faculty in other disciplines, boards of trustees and regents, home economics administrators, boards of higher education, and leaders of allied groups, to increase their understanding of the needs of young families and of the competencies needed by professionals who work with these families.
- o Investigate private and State funding sources to support statewide coalitions and functioning networks for building and maintaining healthy families.
- o Involve client families and organizations as advisors.

SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR STATE WORKSHOP ON STRATEGIES FOR COORDINATING  
AND IMPLEMENTING NEW INITIATIVES IN HOME ECONOMICS

Purpose: To develop planning and budgeting strategies for cooperative research, extension, and higher education within the State to implement initiatives selected as State priorities.

Focus: Selected initiatives from Misc. Pub. 1405.

Sponsorship: Institutions or units in State with home economics programs in research, extension, and higher education.

Planning committee:

Attendance:

30-40 persons from State, selected to obtain a cross-section of groups such as the following:

Home economics administrators--college, school, or department  
Extension administrators and program staff--State, area, county  
Experiment station--administrators, scientists  
College or university teaching faculty  
Relevant State agencies  
Homemakers associations, county councils, alumni associations  
State home economics association

Time: Three days, beginning at 1:00 p.m. on first day and ending at noon the third day.

Place: Arranged by planning committee.

Budgetary arrangements:

Each participant responsible for own travel expenses and support. Other expenses (for meeting rooms, supplies, postage, etc.) could be covered by a registration fee or institutional donation.

## Format for Sessions:

| Time       | Topic/Activity  | Suggested Amount of Time | Speaker(s)/Groups  |
|------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| Day 1      |   |                          |  |
| 12:30 p.m. | Registration: Participants pick up agenda, nametags, copy of Misc. Pub. 1405, and list of participants  | 30 min.                  |  |
| 1:00 p.m.* | Orientation to purposes of workshop<br><br>Background and present status of national effort of New Initiatives  | 20 min.                  | Moderator<br><br>Planning committee or representative from national Steering Committee or USDA |
|            | State situations  |                          |  |
|            | a. Population trends; and budgeting situation in State.   | 15 min.                  | (e.g., demographer)  |
|            | b. Program planning and budgeting process in State (funding sources and policies, process for budget submission).   | 30 min.                  | (e.g., member of State board of higher education)  |
|            | c. Present status of home economics programs in State--research, professional education, extension.   | 30 min.                  | Panel of home economics administrators   |
| 3:00 p.m.  | Break   |                          |  |
| 3:30 p.m.  | Preliminary discussion of outcome targets. (Discussion in work groups--one group for each initiative: brainstorming to identify State targets for initiatives.) | 30 min.                  | Initiatives work groups  |
| 4:30 p.m.  | Instructions for group discussion on Day 2. Sources: Framework for group discussion; Misc. Pub. 1405.   | 30 min.                  | Moderator, group leaders, and recorders  |

\*General session

| <u>Time</u>  | <u>Topic/Activity</u>  | <u>Suggested Amount of Time</u> | <u>Speaker(s)/Groups</u>                         |
|--------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <u>Day 2</u> |  |                                 |  |
| 8:30 a.m.*   | The planning approach—Issues and planning concepts.<br>Source: Misc. Pub. 1405, pp. 23-25, 30-31.  | 30 min.                         | Moderator  |
| 9:00 a.m.    | Establishment of outcome targets for each initiative. (Discussion in work groups.)   | 2 hours                         | Initiatives work groups                          |
| 11:00 a.m.*  | Report on outcome targets and discussion.<br>(Written reports to be turned in by work group leaders and photocopied for use in synthesis work groups.) | 45 min.                         | Initiatives work group leaders; all participants |
| 12:00 noon   | Lunch  | 2-3 hours                       | Synthesis work groups                            |
| 1:30 p.m.    | Establishment and synthesis of 2-, 5-, and 10-year action targets for each initiative.<br>(Discussion in work groups.)                                 |                                 |  |
| <u>Day 3</u> |  |                                 |  |
| 8:00 a.m.    | Breakfast meeting (optional)   |                                 | Moderator with reactor panel                     |
| 9:00 a.m.*   | Report on action targets   | 1 hour                          | Synthesis work group leaders                     |
|              | Reaction and comment   | 40 min.                         | Reactor panel of State resource persons          |
|              | Discussion of followup   | 30 min.                         | All participants                                 |
| 11:30 a.m.   | Adjournment. All written reports to be turned in by this time.   |                                 |  |

\*General session

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

### At least 2-3 months in advance of workshop:

1. Select initiatives and focus groups.
2. Select date and location of meeting. Reserve rooms, equipment and meals. Meeting space is needed for each discussion group in addition to a room for the general sessions.
3. Arrange program, select presenters and reactor panel and issue invitations to presenters (may need to have alternates on tap). Arrange for publicity and news release, if desired.
4. Prepare list of participants to be invited and mail out invitations. (See sample letter and enclosure.) Monitor acceptances and reaffirm invitations and/or extend invitation list if needed to obtain a good cross-section of relevant groups.
5. Order copies of Misc. Pub. 1405 for all participants (see Preface for how to order these).

### Immediately prior to workshop:

6. Prepare workshop handouts: agenda, workgroup assignments, worksheets, discussion guide, nametags, list of attendees.
7. Select discussion leaders and recorders for discussion groups; assign participants to work groups. Note: initiatives work groups should be organized to include those with expertise and interest in the respective initiative, but should also be arranged to include persons from each of the functional areas (research, higher education, extension). Synthesis work groups should include those with expertise and interest in the respective functional areas and should include at least one person from each initiatives work group.
8. Obtain one-paragraph resume from major speakers for use in introductions.
9. Provide supplies for discussion groups. Each group should have an easel, newsprint, felt-tip pens, and masking tape. Reporters will need paper and pencil.
10. Arrange for photocopying discussion group reports as needed during workshop.

### During workshop:

11. Preside at workshop and coordinate workshop activities.
12. Coordinate work groups: conduct pre-session briefing for leaders and recorders, give instructions to work groups, collect written reports and discussion notes from work groups, photocopy reports from initiatives work groups for use by synthesis groups, collect reports from synthesis groups, meet with reactor panel.

### Following workshop:

13. Write any planned-for reports.
14. Provide feedback to participants; write thank-you letters.

FRAMEWORK FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS  
(handout to discussion leaders and recorders)

The Context

All participants are invited to present their suggestions, questions, proposals, examples, assessments, arguments and doubts. Because time is limited, however, discussion should be within the perimeters suggested by the factors:

1. The need to establish targets for the State, while maintaining identity with the national initiatives, as described in Misc. Pub. 1405.
2. The need to identify and take account of the particular roles and policies of agencies, institutions, organizations, and funding sources in the State.
3. The need to adequately portray the contribution that extension, research, and professional education can make to the State initiatives and targets, and plan for integration of these functions.

Sources

Misc. Pub. 1405, Exhibit 1 (p.35) and other pertinent examples from pp. 35-60.

Discussion

Initiatives work groups:

Question: What outcome or results of implementing this initiatives do we want to see in place 10 years from now?

Response: Outcome targets, corresponding to column 1 in exhibit 1.

Worksheet: 1

Synthesis work groups:

Question: What action is needed to bring these targets or goals to reality? 2-year targets for action? 5-year targets? 10-year targets? Who (or what organizations or agencies) should be involved as leaders? performers? facilitators? entities to be kept informed?

Response: Action targets for functional area, corresponding to columns 2-4 in exhibit 1.

Worksheet: 2

### Responsibilities of Leaders and Recorders

The group leaders should "facilitate" the following conditions:

1. Participants can hear and each person has an opportunity to contribute.
2. All questions for discussion are carefully considered.
3. Key ideas are continuously recorded on newsprint displayed on easel or taped on wall, so that all members of the group can see what is being recorded as the sense of the discussion.
4. Time is allocated for summing up. Group leader and/or recorder identify key ideas to share with all workshop participants.

The group recorder should include the following information in the report of the group:

1. The assigned topic of the work group and the names of leader, recorder, and members.
2. Summarized responses of group to their assigned questions.

The group leader (with help of the recorder) should prepare a brief oral presentation of the group report.

The recorder (with help of the group leader) should prepare a written report to be handed in at a designated time, using the worksheets provided.

NEW INITIATIVES IN HOME ECONOMICS - STATE WORKSHOP

Worksheet 1

Initiative \_\_\_\_\_

Group Leader \_\_\_\_\_ Recorder \_\_\_\_\_

Members \_\_\_\_\_

I Outcome Targets: What outcomes or results do we want to see in 10 years?

in nonformal education of focus group

in research for focus group

in professional education of workers serving focus group

in coordinating and integrating, research, nonformal education, and professional education

in interaction of educators and researchers with constituencies and support groups

NEW INITIATIVES IN HOME ECONOMICS - STATE WORKSHOP

Worksheet 2

Functional area \_\_\_\_\_

Group Leader \_\_\_\_\_ Recorder \_\_\_\_\_

Members \_\_\_\_\_

II Action Targets:      What action is needed?      Who should be involved?

2 years

5 years

10 years

SAMPLE LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear

A workshop, involving a cross section of leadership in (State), is being held (date and place). Its purpose is statewide planning for implementing new initiatives in home economics. We invite you to participate in this workshop.

The workshop will be concerned with initiatives identified as national priorities in "A Comprehensive National Plan for New Initiatives in Home Economics Research, Extension, and Higher Education." The outcome of the workshop is to be program targets for the initiatives and strategies for achieving these targets through expanded effort in research, extension, and professional education. A copy of the workshop agenda is enclosed.

We anticipate that families in (State) will benefit from the extension, formal education, and public service activities generated by the New Initiatives Workshop. The State should also benefit because research proposals stimulated by the Workshop will produce findings useful in public policy decisions. As a participant, you will have an opportunity for input into the planning for these activities.

A tear sheet is enclosed for your convenience in replying. If you have questions after reading the enclosures, don't hesitate to call. Phone numbers are listed for each of us below.

We look forward to hearing from you and seeing you at the New Initiatives Workshop.

Sincerely,

Sample Enclosure with Letter of Invitation

NEW INITIATIVES IN HOME ECONOMICS WORKSHOP

Purpose: To develop strategies to serve families through new initiatives\* for home economics in research, extension, and professional education.

Content:

- 1) Background and present status of national effort toward new initiatives in Home Economics
- 2) Review of State situation: population trends; program planning and budgeting process; and current activity in research, extension, and professional education.
- 3) Discussion topics\*  
(insert initiatives selected by planning committee)
- 4) Recommendations from work groups regarding the topics discussed.

Time and Location: (Insert information)

.....

\*Selected from "A Comprehensive National Plan for New Initiatives in Home Economics Research, Extension and Higher Education." U. S. Department of Agriculture, Science and Education Administration, Misc. Pub. No. 1405, January, 1981.

NEW INITIATIVES IN HOME ECONOMICS WORKSHOP

       I will be able to participate.

       I will not be able to participate.

\_\_\_\_\_ (Name)

Return to: (Address)



